

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing preliminary amendments to the claims and abstract and the following remarks.

***Status of the Claims***

In the present Amendment, claim 10 has been amended. and claims 17-18 have been added. Claim 5 was previously canceled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 6-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 16 and 17 are independent.

No new matter has been added with the presentation of the amendment and new claims. An obvious grammatical error is corrected in claim 10. Also with regard to claim 10, please see page 26, line 2 of paragraph [00111] for the term “dissolving.” Thus, this is a clarifying and not a narrowing amendment such that Applicants are in no way conceding any limitations with respect to the interpretation of the claims under the Doctrine of Equivalents. The new claims are fully supported by the original disclosure and claims. For example, new claim 17 has support in claims 1, 14 and 15, as well as in the present specification at, e.g., paragraphs [0019], [0030] and [00100]. Finally, for claim 18, please see pending claims 1 and 10.

Also regarding new method claims 17 and 18, if the Examiner believes that these claims are directed to a different invention, Applicants respectfully request a declaration to that effect.

The amendment to the Abstract also does not add new matter. The Abstract now reflects claim 1 of the present application.

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the only rejection and allow the currently pending claims.

***Substance of the Interview***

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time, helpfulness and courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the Interview of October 4, 2007. The assistance of the Examiner in advancing prosecution of the present application is greatly appreciated. In compliance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04, Applicants submit the following remarks.

The Interview Summary form sufficiently summarizes the discussions at the Interview. Various ways of addressing the prior art rejections were discussed. More specifically, during the Interview, Applicants stressed that the Pinnow *et al.* '111 reference (GB 1305111) does not disclose a semiconductor light emitting component. Instead, Pinnow *et al.* '111 discloses a cadmium ion laser and an argon ion laser for emitting a beam of radiation at certain wavelength, but this laser does not freely shift the wavelength of the light. Also during the Interview, Applicants discussed how Komoto *et al.* '824 (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,824) is not considered prior art against the presently pending claims (explained in more detail below). Applicants stated that the earliest priority date of Komoto *et al.* '824 (September 1 or 2, 1997) is still after the filing date of the first U.S. application (which is July 29, 1997 for Applic. No. 08/902,725) related to the present application.

Further, Applicants presented the Examiner with a movie (on DVD) explaining the products of the Assignee. In addition, Applicants presented the Examiner with some white LED products that showed the blue light source (the semiconductor component) as well the yellow light source (the resin composition containing the phosphor).

***Issues under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinnow *et al.* '111 (GB 1305111) in view of Komoto *et al.* '824 (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,824) (see paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action). Applicants respectfully traverse, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Komoto *et al.* '824 is not prior art**

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been instantly overcome. Komoto *et al.* '824 is only available as prior art as of its U.S. filing date of August 31, 1998, or one of the 1997 dates for the Japanese priority documents. The present application claims benefit of several U.S. applications as well as several Japanese patent applications (see also paragraph [0001] of the present specification). For instance, Applicants note Application Serial No. 08/902,725 (the first application in the chain of applications related to the present application), or U.S. Patent No. 5,998,925. The '925 patent has a U.S. filing date of July 29, 1997, which is before the earliest possible priority dates for Komoto *et al.* '824. In particular, Komoto *et al.* '824 claims priority to three Japanese patent applications having filing dates of September 1, 1997 or September 2, 1997. Thus, Komoto *et al.* '824 is not prior to the present invention.

The Combination of Pinnow *et al.* '111 and Komoto *et al.* '824

In addition, as discussed above, Pinnow *et al.* '111 does not teach or suggest at least the claimed semiconductor light emitting component. Though this is also admitted in the Office Action, Applicants note the problem with Pinnow *et al.* '111 in that the cadmium ion laser and an argon ion laser of the cited reference does not freely shift wavelength of its light. Applicants note the discussion of the cadmium-ion laser or argon-ion laser at page 2, left column, lines 15-16 of Pinnow *et al.* '111 (see also Figure 2).

Furthermore, adding the disclosure in Komoto *et al.* '824 does not overcome this problem of Pinnow *et al.* '111. Applicants note that the disclosure of the secondary reference of Komoto *et al.* '824 was not available at the time of the filing (or priority date) of the present application (e.g., Komoto *et al.* '824 came after the present invention). Therefore, there can be no suggestion to modify the disclosure of Pinnow *et al.* '111.

Thus, the rejection in view of Pinnow *et al.* '111 and Komoto *et al.* '824 has been (instantly) overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the consideration of the previously-filed Information Disclosure Statements.

A full and complete response has been made to all issues as cited in the Office Action. Applicants have taken substantial steps in efforts to advance prosecution of the present

Application No. 10/609,402

Docket No.: 0020-5147P

Art Unit 2879

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2007

application. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance issue for the present case.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez (Reg. No. 48,501) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: OCT 16 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Abstract (clean copy)